

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JUL 25 2005**

Docket No. 740756-2205

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:	)
Ritsuko KAWASAKI et al.	) Confirmation No. 2171
Application No. 09/651,889	) Group Art Unit: 2891
Filed: August 30, 2000	) Examiner: Dana Farahani
For: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE,	)
MANUFACTURING METHOD	) July 25, 2005
THEREOF AND ELECTRONIC	)
DEVICE	)

**SECOND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Mail Stop **AMENDMENT**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed March 23, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

In the most recent Office Action, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1, 11-16 and 21-24, and newly rejected claim 18, under 35 U.S.C. §102, as allegedly being anticipated by Mano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,294,796). The Action also maintained the rejection of claims 2, 3, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103, as allegedly being obvious over the Mano et al. patent in view of Japanese patent publication no. [4]04152676A (hereinafter, "the '676 document'"), and the Section 103 rejection of claims 10 and 17 over Mano et al. in view of Japanese patent publication no. 2001028338 (hereinafter, "the '338 document'"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Starting at page 5, section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Applicants arguments filed in the response dated December 28, 2004, were not considered persuasive. More specifically, in response to Applicants' argument with respect to claims 1-3 that the